

REMARKS

Applicants reply to the Final Office Action mailed on March 17, 2010 within two months. Claims 28-47 are pending in the application and the Examiner rejects claims 28-47. Applicants cancel claim 44 without prejudice to presenting the same or similar claim in this or a related application. Applicants add new claim 48. Support for the amendments and new claim may be found in the originally-filed specification, claims, and figures. No new matter is entered with these amendments and new claim. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 28-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Aggarwal et al, US Patent No. 6,917,969 (“Aggarwal”) in view of Sheshadri, “Understanding JavaServer Pages Model 2 architecture”, December 1999, pages 1-14 (“Sheshadri”) and further in view of Baker et al, US Publication No. 2004/0039990 (“Baker”). Applicants respectfully disagree with these rejections, but Applicants present claim amendments in order to clarify the patentable aspects of the claims and to expedite prosecution.

Aggarwal relates to cross-platform rendering of content in variable presentation environments (see col. 1, lines 8-10). Aggarwal fails to teach or suggest that a formatting instruction corresponding to a field name is obtained, where the formatting instruction specifies an input interface element including at least one of: a button, a check box, a radio box, a text field, a menu, a list, and a drop-down box and “formatting program code corresponding to the input interface element specified in the formatting instruction, wherein the program code is configured to enable a value corresponding to the field name to be input via the input interface element.” As such, the Aggarwal system fails to enable providing standardized input interface elements. For example, the Aggarwal system does not include presenting multiple webpages through which a user can enter an annual income amount, where each webpage includes the same input interface element (e.g., a text field that allows five digits to be entered). That is, nothing in the Aggarwal system prevents, for example, presentation of a first web page that includes a text field that allows five digits to be entered to specify the annual income, a second web page that includes a text field that allows six digits to be entered to specify the annual income, and a third web page that includes a drop-down box that allows a particular salary range to be selected to specify the annual income.

Sheshadri is understood to relate to a Model-View-Controller design for separating presentation from content using JavaServer Pages (JSP) (see Summary). Nothing has been found in Sheshadri that is believed to remedy the deficiencies of Aggarwal et al. identified above.

Baker is understood to relate to an automated form and data analysis tool that provides mechanisms for developing, maintaining, and manipulating forms, and for extracting information from the forms (see paragraph 2). Nothing has been found in Baker that remedies the deficiencies of Aggarwal identified above.

The Examiner points out that the “claim language does not expressly include language to prevent the argued limitations or situation from occurring.” **The Examiner recommends amending the claims to “include language that clarifies/includes the action of ‘preventing’....” Applicants amend the claims in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion.**

None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or contemplate, at least the following limitation as recited in independent claim 28 (emphasis added) and as similarly recited in claims 38 and 48, “wherein the **program code prevents the input to be received via a second input interface element**, and wherein the first input interface element is different from the second input interface element.” Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent claims 28, 38 and 48 are allowable over the cited references.

Dependent claims 29-37, 39-43 and 45-47 variously depend from independent claims 28 and 38, so dependent claims 29-37, 39-43 and 45-47 are allowable over the cited references for the reasons set forth above, in addition to their own unique features, some of which are stated above.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims properly set forth that Applicants regard as their invention and are allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience, if that would help further prosecution of the subject application. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due to Deposit Account No. 19-2814.

Respectfully submitted,



James M. Hennessee
Reg. No. 62,659

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 E. Van Buren
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-382-6516
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: mhennessee@swlaw.com